Appl. No. 10/698/231 Amdt. Dated: 11/16/2004 Reply to Office Action of 10/25/2004

## **APPENDIX**

## TO THE RESPONSE TO THE OFFICE ACTION NOTICE MAILED ON OCTOBER 25, 2004

## **CONTENTS:**

-NEW SIGNED PAGE TO REPLACE THE UNSIGNED <u>Page 22 of 23</u> OF THE ARGUMENTS IN THE RESPONSE FILED ON JULY 24, 2004 TO THE OFFICE ACTION NOTICE MAILED ON MAY 17, 2004.

-STATEMENT SIGNED BY THE APPLICANT, DECLARING THAT "NO NEW MATTER HAS BEEN ADDED" TO THE SUBSTITUTE SPECIFICATION SUBMITTED WITH THE RESPONSE FILED ON JULY 24, 2004 TO THE OFFICE ACTION NOTICED MAILED ON MAY 17, 2004.

-NEW CLEAN LIST OF CLAIMS WITH PROPER NUMBERING TO REPLACE THE CLEAN LIST OF CLAIMS WITH IMPROPER NUMBERING INCLUDED IN THE RESPONSE FILED ON JULY 24, 2004 TO THE OFFICE ACTION NOTICE MAILED ON MAY 17, 2004.

Appl. No. 10/698/231

Amdt. Dated: 07/23/2004

Reply to Office Action of 05/17/2004

to differentiate both elements. For example, in FIG. 1A, is shown and referred to for the

first time the movable edible piece identified as 102, with spherical shape, and in FIG. 1E

is shown and referred to for the first time a movable edible piece too, but with conical

shape, identified as 102'.

5) For the indications of movement, dotted arrow lines are used, designated by a capital M

followed by consecutive numbers, which are repeated in different figures, whenever

components with the same function are involved in movements which are of the same

type and direction. And for the identification of sections, details and direction of views,

consecutive not repeated roman numbers are used.

**Final comments** 

Since the Specification was plagued with misused terms and formal deficiencies requiring

substantial and extensive amendment, in addition to the Marked up version, of the original

Specification, a new clean version has been included as Substitute Specification, and the

author respectfully requests the replacement of the original version with this Substitute

Specification as well as the Abstract of Disclosure with the new one also included.

The author hopes that the present response to the Office Action Notice of May 17, 2004, will

be satisfactory to clarify the misunderstandings and to amend the insufficiencies and mistakes

in the Specification and Claims originally submitted, complying with the Examiner's remarks

and indications.

Respectfully submitted,

Rodolfo Fernandez Jr. Aml

NOTE: For any further clarifications, please, contact the author at your best convenience

Tel/Fax: 704-730-8971; Mobile: 704-692-1081

E-mail: rfern2@carolina.rr.com; rodmar3841@aol.com;

Page 22 of 23

Appl. No. 10/698/231 Amdt. Dated: 11/16/2004 Reply to Office Action of 10/25/2004

## **NO NEW MATTER ADDED STATEMENT**

The undersigned applicant <u>Rodolfo Fernandez Jr.</u>, hereby declares that within the <u>Substitute Specification</u> submitted with the <u>response filed on July 24</u>, <u>2004 to the Office Action Notice mailed on May 17, 2004, no new matter has been added</u> in relation to the original Specification submitted with the patent application.